



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/926,579	02/26/2002	Thomas Giering	GIER3001/JEK	1455

23364 7590 05/04/2004

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 SLATERS LANE
FOURTH FLOOR
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

HESS, BRUCE H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1774

DATE MAILED: 05/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/926,579

Applicant(s)

Giering et al.

Examiner

Bruce Hess

Group Art Unit

1774

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2-26-02 (Pre Amdt.)
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 15-20 is/are rejected.
- ☒ Claim(s) 5-14 is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement

Application Papers

- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d).

☒ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the:

- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____

☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- ☒ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

1. Claims 5-14 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. A multiple dependent claim (e.g., claim 4,) cannot serve as the basis for other multiple dependent claims (e.g., claims 5-4).

2. Claims 1,3,4, and 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either of applicants' statement of the prior art or the patent to Kaule et al. (U.S.P 4,452,843) taken with the patent to Hoppe (DE 41 26 461).

Claims 1-4 and 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the patent to Berger et al. (U.S.P. 6,16,592) in view of the patent to Hoppe.

The primary references teach that luminescent particles are conventionally employed in documents of value (see applicant's specification at page 1, second paragraph; Kaule et al. at column 4, lines 9-23 and column 8, lines 55-57; and Berger et al. at column 2, lines 58-61, column 3, lines 61 and 62, column 5, lines 45 and column 6, lines 46-48). The secondary reference teaches the advantages of employing luminescent particles of dye-laden molecular sieves as optical data memories. Substitution of Hoffe's dye-laden molecular sieve luminescent particles for the generically disclosed luminescent particles of the primary references would have been an obvious expedient to one of ordinary skill in this art given the advantages disclosed by Hoffe.

Application/Control Number: 09/926,579


Page 3

Art Unit: 1774

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Bruce Hess at telephone number (571) 272-1525.

B. Hess/af

April 06, 2004

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Bruce Hess", with a stylized flourish at the end.

BRUCE H. HESS
PRIMARY EXAMINER